

REMARKS

Claims

Claims 1-28 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 15, and 22 are in independent form and amended herein. Support for the amendments is found in the specification at least at paragraphs 0013 and 0040 and Figure 2. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 102

At section 1 of the *Office Action*, claims 1, 2, 4-12, and 14-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. Appl. Pub. No. 2002/0067335 ("Millington"). Millington is directed to a graphical user interface for a navigation system. Applicants respectfully request the removal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-12, and 14-21 because Millington does not disclose the limitations of the amended claims for at least the following reasons.

Amended claim 1 of the instant application requires that "the display further comprises a stroke display area for displaying strokes identifiable by the first and second cardinal states." Strokes are the actions used to build up characters. *See* application at paragraph 0006. Millington does not disclose the use of strokes or a stroke display area for displaying strokes identifiable by first and second cardinal states. Therefore, Millington does not disclose a required feature of claim 1 of the application.

Because each element of claim 1 is not disclosed in Millington, Millington does not anticipate claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the removal of the rejection of claim 1. Claims 2, 4-12, and 14 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons described *supra*; therefore, removal of the rejection of claims 2, 4-12, and 14 is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 is directed to a method which has features that are similar to claim 1. As such, the arguments outlined above with regard to claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 15

and its dependent claims. Thus, Applicants respectfully request removal of the rejection of claims 15-21 for the reasons given *supra*.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103

At page 7 of the Office Action, claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Millington. The Examiner further cites that it is well known in the art to use “shortcut keys.” See *Office Action* at page 7. Even if true (which Applicants do not concede), such a suggestion would not overcome the deficiencies of Millington discussed *supra*—specifically, Millington does not disclose a stroke display area for displaying strokes identifiable by the first and second cardinal states. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of dependent claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn for the reasons stated above.

At page 8 of the Office Action, claim 13 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Millington and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,054,941 (“Chen”). The Examiner cites Chen for the proposition that “...Chen teaches a symbol having both the first feature and the second feature is included in both the first category and the second category....” See *Office Action* at page 8. Even if true (which Applicants do not concede), such a suggestion would not overcome the deficiencies of Millington discussed *supra*—specifically, neither Chen nor Millington discloses or suggests a stroke display area for displaying strokes identifiable by the first and second cardinal states. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of dependent claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn for the reasons stated above.

At page 8 of the Office Action, claims 22-28 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Millington and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,307,549 (“King et al.”). Independent claim 22 is similar to claim 15, and claim 22 has features similar to those in claim 1. Not surprisingly, Millington was cited in the *Office Action* for reasons similar to those levied against independent claim 1. King et al. is cited for the proposition that King et al. teaches an indicator system operable by a human eye. See *Office Action* at page 9. Even if true (which Applicants do not concede), such a suggestion would not overcome the deficiencies of Millington discussed *supra*—specifically, neither King et al. nor Millington discloses or

suggests a stroke display area for displaying strokes identifiable by the first and second cardinal states. This feature is required by independent claim 22 and those claims which depend from claim 22. Therefore, a combination of Millington and King et al. does not render the invention claimed in claims 22-28 obvious. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 22-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn for the reasons stated above.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response to the *Office Action* has been made. Favorable reconsideration of the application is kindly sought. If the Examiner has any further questions or concerns, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney.

The Applicants believe that no extension-of-time is needed in order to enter this *Amendment and Response*. If an extension-of-time is needed, please consider this to be a petition for an extension-of-time sufficient to enter this *Amendment and Response*. The fee for an extension-of-time (if needed) should be charged to Deposit Account No. 08-2442.

If any other fees are required in order to have this *Amendment and Response* entered and considered, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 08-2442.

Respectfully submitted,
HODGSON RUSS LLP

By /Alfonzo I. Cutaia #60,070/
Alfonzo I. Cutaia, Reg. No. 60,070

AIC/

The Guaranty Building
140 Pearl Street, Suite 100

Appl. No. 10/561,653
Amdt. dated February 25, 2009
Reply to Office Action of November 25, 2008

Buffalo, New York 14202-4040
(716) 856-4000
DATED: February 25, 2009